

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION**

**RAUL SOLIS III, JUAN A.
BUSTAMANTE, JR, RON JONES,
FERNANDO RICHARD, VICTOR M.
JUAREZ, WILLIAM R. STOLZ, SERGIO
ALVAREZ, TRACY WOODSON,
HERMAN CRUTCHER, TOBY B.
LEDOUX, JESSE VERA, BRUCE A.
JOHNSON, HANK MOSER, BURTON
BIENVENUE, ROBERT D. TAYLOR, and
RYAN BENN,**

Plaintiffs,

V.

**CRESCENT DRILLING AND
PRODUCTION, INC.; and CRESCENT
DRILLING FOREMAN, INC.,**

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. SA-19-CA-1194-FB

**ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge (docket no. 228) concerning Defendants Crescent Drilling and Production, Inc., and Crescent Drilling Foreman, Inc.'s Motion for Decertification (docket no. 220) and Plaintiffs' Motion for Tolling (docket no. 223). To date, no objections to the Report and Recommendation have been received.¹

Because no party has objected to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, the Court need not conduct a de novo review. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) ("A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings and recommendations


¹ Any party who desires to object to a Magistrate's findings and recommendations must serve and file his, her or its written objections within fourteen days after being served with a copy of the findings and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 635(b)(1). If service upon a party is made by mailing a copy to the party's last known address, "service is complete upon mailing." FED. R. CIV. P. 5(b)(2)(C). If service is by electronic means, "service is complete upon transmission." *Id.* at (E).

to which objection is made."). The Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation and finds its reasoning to be neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge (docket no. 228) is ACCEPTED pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) such that Defendants Crescent Drilling and Production, Inc. and Crescent Drilling Foreman, Inc.'s Motion for Decertification (docket no. 220) and Plaintiffs' Motion for Tolling (docket no. 223) are **GRANTED**, the claims of the opt-in Plaintiffs are **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**, and the statute of limitations on those claims is **TOLLED** for **60 days** from the date of dismissal. This case continues to be referred to the Magistrate Judge for further pretrial proceedings.

It is so ORDERED.

SIGNED this 27th day of June, 2022.



FRED BIERY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE